UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,123	12/31/2003	Steven M. Blumenfeld	06975-421001 / Communicat	1741

26171 7590 11/10/2008

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
WANG, KENT F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,123	BLUMENFELD, STEVEN M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KENT WANG	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10-36,41,42 and 44-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-36, 41-42, and 44-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments, filed on 08/08/2008, have been entered and made of record. Claims 1-8, 10-36, 41-42, and 44-51 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-36, 41-42, and 44-51 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 17-18, 21, 23-25, 30-31, 34, 36, and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yonezawa (US 7,187,402).

Regarding claim 1, Yonezawa discloses a method of presenting a user with a multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) corresponding to a venue (the arrangement of seats in an office or store), the method comprising:

- managing a sensor array having at least two sensors (camera selecting buttons for a plurality of cameras, Figs 32-33) that are configured to provide a stream of data

units (Fig 3 shows a stream of data units, camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . .) (7:15-41 and 16:30-39);

- determining locations for the sensors in the sensor array to provide location information (the camera managing server 50 holds static information related to the respective cameras, such as the locations at which the respective cameras are installed) (17:27-46);
- associating the location information with the sensors in the sensor array (the camera control server 52 displays the locations and directions where both the cameras connected to the monitoring terminal 40 and all the available cameras through the network 46 are installed so that predetermined corresponding camera symbols overlap with the map on the display screen of the monitoring terminal 40) (17:47-57);
- enabling the user to perceive a map (a map window 60, Fig 36) related to the venue (a map that shows the arrangement of seats in an office or store is displayed on the map window 60) (17:64-18:27);
- relating the perceived map (a map window 60, Fig 36) to one or more of the sensors in the sensor array (on the map window 60, the camera icons 66-1 to 66-12 which correspond to the respective locations of cameras installed in such an office or store are displayed) (18:13-27);
- receiving a request from the user identifying a selected position within the map (permits a user to freely rearrange the display positions of video camera images so

as to be easy to handle, and to select video camera images to be displayed simultaneously) (11:21-35);

- identifying one or more of the sensors in the sensor array corresponding to the selected position (permits a user to identify and to select video camera images to be displayed simultaneously, thereby giving flexibility to operation of the monitoring system) (11:21-35); and
- presenting to the user the multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) based on one or more streams of data units associated with the identified sensors (a state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are displayed as in Fig 3 which with clicking the tag of map 530, the map 530 is displayed on the map display area 502 as shown in Fig 4, and at the same time, camera icons 531, 532, 533, . . . located on the map 530 are displayed) (6:1-23).

Regarding claim 2, Yonezawa discloses more than one sensor in the sensor array is identified (camera selecting buttons for a plurality of cameras, Figs 32-33), and wherein presenting to the user the multimedia experience includes providing a multimedia experience based on streams of data received from the more than one identified sensors (permits a user to freely rearrange the display positions of video camera images so as to be easy to handle, and to select video camera images to be displayed based on a stream of data units, camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . .) (7:15-41, 11:21-35 and 16:30-39).

Regarding claim 3, Yonezawa discloses managing the sensor array (the camera managing server 50, Fig 35) includes operating multiple camera systems (a plurality of cameras, Figs 32-33), the camera systems each including a video capture system and a location provider system (the camera managing server 50 holds static information related to the respective cameras, such as the locations at which the respective cameras are installed, and dynamic information representing the present condition as to whether or not the cameras are being controlled or images from the cameras are being displayed, and the names of the terminals provided with the function of video composing as the map window 60 displays camera icons which represent the locations) (17:27-46).

Regarding claim 5, Yonezawa discloses operating the multiple camera systems (a plurality of cameras as indicating in the camera selecting buttons, Figs 32-33) includes operating two or more camera systems that provide video (i.e. camera icons 521, 522, 523, . .., Fig 3) (7:15-41 and 16:30-39).

Regarding claim 8, Yonezawa discloses managing the sensor array (a plurality of cameras) include managing more than one type of sensor (various sensors for different static information related to the respective cameras, such as the names of the respective cameras, the names of the terminals to which the cameras are connected, the locations at which the respective cameras are installed, whether or not the panning, tilting and zooming of the cameras can be controlled, and dynamic information representing the present condition as to whether or not the cameras are being controlled or images from the cameras are being displayed, and the names of the terminals provided with the function of video composing) (17:27-46).

Regarding claim 17, this claim recites same limitations as claim 1. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 18, Yonezawa discloses notifying the user about the availability of the better-matching sensor (video camera) includes enabling the user to receive to the stream of data units (maps 510-540, Fig 3) from the better matching sensor (a computer for controlling the video camera 10 connected to the camera control circuit 12 by sending a control code to the camera control circuit 12 and for transmitting video data obtained from the video camera 10 through a network interface 38 to the network) (4:24-34).

Regarding claim 21, Yonezawa discloses presenting to the user the multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) includes combining the one or more stream of data units (maps 510-540, Fig 3) with other streams of data units from other sensors in the sensor array (camera selecting buttons for a plurality of cameras, Figs 32-33) into a combined stream of data units and enabling the user to access the combined stream of data units (6:1-23).

Regarding claim 23, Yonezawa discloses combining the one or more stream of data units (maps 510-540, Fig 3) includes enabling presentation of a simulated view from a location where no sensor is located (Fig 5 shows only the six video display areas but no sensor icon is present) (6:24-41 and Fig 5).

Regarding claim 24, Yonezawa discloses presenting to the user the multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) includes performing intermediary processing on the one or more streams of data units (maps 510-540, Fig 3) to generate an edited stream of data units and enabling the user to access the edited stream (a

state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are displayed as in Fig 3 which with clicking the tag of map 530, the map 530 is displayed on the map display area 502 as shown in Fig 4, and at the same time, camera icons 531, 532, 533, . . . located on the map 530 are displayed) (6:1-23).

As to claim 25, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the claim 1 is a method claim whereas claim 25 is apparatus. Thus the apparatus claim 25 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respected to claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, these claims recite same limitations as claims 17 and 18, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 17 and 18 above.

Regarding claims 34 and 36, these claims recite same limitations as claims 21 and 23, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 21 and 23 above.

Regarding claim 44, Yonezawa discloses a method of presenting a user with a multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) corresponding to a venue (the arrangement of seats in an office or store), the method comprising:

- managing a first sensor (i.e. camera 521) and a second sensor (i.e. camera 523) (Fig 6 and 6:1-23);
- determining, at a first time (i.e. map 510, Fig 6), a first location of the first sensor (521) and a first location of the second sensor (523) (Fig 6 and 6:1-23);

- enabling display (a map window 500, Fig 6), to a user, of a map related to the venue (a layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (Fig 6 and 6:1-23);
- enabling display (a map window 500, Fig 6), to the user, of the first sensor's first location and the second sensor's first location (map 510, Fig 6) on the map related to the venue (a layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (Fig 6 and 6:1-23);
- determining, at a second time (i.e. map 520, Fig 6), a second location of the first sensor (521) and a second location of the second sensor (523), wherein the second time is after the first time (the user can select one specified camera for displaying an image by selecting one button from these buttons on the screen which permits a user to freely rearrange the display positions of video camera images so as to be easy to handle, and to select map 510 before map 520) (11:21-35 and 15:61-16:11),
- the first sensor's second location is different from the first sensor's first location, and the second sensor's second location is different from the second sensor's first location (Fig 3 shows a state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are displayed as a plurality of maps 520, 530, 540, . . . ; e.g. map 510 represents a first location of a office, map 520 represents a second location of a shop or a warehouse, as each indicating a different layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (6:1-23);

- enabling display (a map window 500, Fig 6), to the user, of the first sensor's (521) second location and the second sensor's (523) second location on the map (map 520) related to the venue (the arrangement of seats in an office or store) 6:42-7:9);
- receiving a request, from the user, identifying one of the first sensor and the second sensor (permits a user to freely rearrange the display positions of video camera images so as to be easy to handle, and to select video camera images to be displayed simultaneously) (11:21-35); and
- enabling display (a map window 500, Fig 6), to the user, of the multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) based on one or more streams of data received from the identified one of the first sensor and the second sensor (a state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are displayed as in Fig 3 which with clicking the tag of map 530, the map 530 is displayed on the map display area 502 as shown in Fig 4, and at the same time, camera icons 531, 532, 533, . . . located on the map 530 are displayed) (6:1-23).

Regarding claim 45, Yonezawa discloses the first sensor's second location is different from the first sensor's first location, and the second sensor's second location is different from the second sensor's first location (Fig 3 shows a state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are displayed as a plurality of maps 520, 530, 540, . . . ; e.g. map 510 represents a first location of a office, map 520 represents a second location of a

shop or a warehouse, as each indicating a different layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (6:1-23);

Regarding claim 46, Yonezawa discloses enabling display (a map window 500, Fig 6), to the user, of the first sensor's second location and the second sensor's second location (map 520, Fig 6) on the map related to the venue (a layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (Fig 6 and 6:1-23) includes removing, from the map, the first sensor's first location and the second sensor's first location (maps 520, 530, 540, . . . , each indicating a different layout of an office, a shop, or a warehouse, thus each map has a different layout of the sensor's locations, e.g. an office, a shop, or a warehouse) (6:1-23).

Regarding claim 47, Yonezawa discloses the sensor array includes managing a camera system (the camera managing server 50 is software to manage all the cameras, connected to the network 46, which can be utilized by the monitoring terminal 40) (7:27-46), the camera system including a video sensor and an audio sensor (a camera input selector 14 selects which of the video cameras 10-1 to 10-3 to control, in order to take in an output signal from the selected camera, and the output signal is normally a video signal, but both a video signal and an audio signal when a microphone-equipped camera is used) (14:60-15:3).

Regarding claim 48, Yonezawa discloses enabling the user to perceive the map includes enabling display (a map window 60, Fig 36), to the user, of the relative orientation and scale of physical elements of the entertainment event or venue, other than the streams of data units associated with the sensors in the sensor array (a map that shows the arrangement of seats in an office or store is displayed on the map window 60, and on this map the camera icons 66-1

to 66-12 which correspond to the respective locations of cameras installed in such an office or store are displayed) (17:64-18:27).

Regarding claim 49, this claim recites same limitations as claim 48. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 48 above.

Regarding claim 50, Yonezawa discloses identifying the one or more of the sensors in the sensor array (Fig 3 shows a stream of data units, camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . .) corresponding to the selected position includes: identifying multiple sensors in the sensor array (the camera control server 52 displays the locations and directions where both the cameras connected to the monitoring terminal 40 and all the available cameras through the network 46 are installed so that predetermined corresponding camera symbols overlap with the map on the display screen of the monitoring terminal 40) (17:47-57); and identifying two or more sensors in the sensory array in proximity to the selected position, the two or more sensors in the sensory array being fewer than all of the multiple sensors in the sensor array (permits a user to identify and to select video camera images to be displayed simultaneously, thereby giving flexibility to operation of the monitoring system, and Fig 3 shows a stream of data units, camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . .) (7:15-41, 11:21-35 and 16:30-39).

Regarding claim 51, Yonezawa discloses presenting to the user the multimedia experience (graphical user interface GUI of the monitoring system) based on the one or more streams of data units associated with the identified sensors includes combining the streams of data units associated with the two or more sensors in closest proximity to the selected position (a state in which the map 520 among the maps 510 to 540 is displayed on the map display area 502 and in which camera icons 521, 522, 523, . . . located on the map 520 are

displayed as in Fig 3 which with clicking the tag of map 530, the map 530 is displayed on the map display area 502 as shown in Fig 4, and at the same time, camera icons 531, 532, 533, . . . located on the map 530 are displayed) (6:1-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 4, 10-12, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa (US 7,187,402) in view of Valleriano (US 2005/0093976).

Regarding claim 4, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Valleriano does teach determining locations for the sensors in the sensor array (digital video cameras 20, Fig 1) includes using the location provider system of each of the camera systems to determine location information (position information) using a Global Positioning system receiver (a GPS technologies) ([0056], Valleriano).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose the GPS technologies as taught by Valleriano into McClintock's video viewing and recording system, so as to easily determine where a camera is located and the direction of its line of sight ([0056], Valleriano).

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Valleriano does teach determining the location for the sensor (camera position) includes determining the location (three-dimensional location data) relative to an architectural structure (tracking system 80)

for the sensor in an entertainment venue (a sports event such as a soccer game) ([0057], Valleriano).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose the tracking system as taught by Valleriano into McClintock's video viewing and recording system, so as to easily correlate asynchronously captured event data and images in a three dimensional volumetric space on a playing field ([0014]-[0015], Valleriano)

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Valleriano does teach using the location for the sensor (camera position) in the entertainment venue (a sports event such as a soccer game) to determine metadata descriptive (i.e. camera ID, photographer ID, camera line-of-sight data and a field of view, Fig 1) of the entertainment experience ([0055], [0057], Valleriano).

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Valleriano does teach enabling the user to perceive and relating the perceived map includes using metadata (i.e. camera ID, photographer ID, camera line-of-sight data and a field of view, Fig 1) to describe the user experience associated with the sensor ([0055], [0057], Valleriano).

Regarding claims 41 and 42, these claims recite same limitations as claim 4. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 4 above.

7. Claims 14-16, 19-20, 27-29 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa (US 7,187,402) in view of McClintock (US 5,598,208).

Regarding claim 14, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose determining a permission level for the user. However, McClintock discloses

determining a permission level for the user (the remote control 116 which regulates access to each compartment as each user would pay in order to gain access to the system) (8:18-31, McClintock).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the access control as taught by McClintock into Yonezawa's communication apparatus, as to provide a as such a control of programming means via wireless transmission with sensors which are coupled to a video system at various locations throughout the event venue (8:18-31, McClintock).

Regarding claim 15, the limitations of claims 1and 14 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose determining the permission level includes determining a level of access to which the user has subscribed. However, McClintock discloses determining the permission level includes determining a level of access to which the user has subscribed (each user could be supplied with a code index which informs the user of a unique identification code to join in the action) (7:47-66, McClintock).

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of claims 1 and 14 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose determining the permission level includes identifying sensors. However, McClintock discloses determining the permission level (regulates access) includes identifying sensors (coupled to a video system at various locations throughout the event venue) that are accessible and inaccessible to the user, and regulating access (regulates access) by the user in response to the permission level (user would key in with the remote control 116, Fig 6B) (8:18-31, McClintock).

Regarding claim 19, the limitations of claims 1 and 17 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose notifying the user about the availability of the better-matching sensor. However, McClintock discloses notifying the user about the availability of the better-matching sensor (video camera) includes enabling the user to upgrade a permission level so that the user may receive a stream of data units from the better matching sensor (each user would pay in order to gain access to the system)(7:47-66, McClintock).

Regarding claim 20, the limitations of claims 1 and 14 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose determining that the permission level supports access to the stream of data units from the better-matching sensor before enabling access to the stream of data units from the better matching sensor. However, McClintock discloses determining that the permission level supports access (regulates access) to the stream of data units from the better-matching sensor before enabling access to the stream of data units from the better matching sensor (receive an overair broadcast video signal from each of cameras) (9:54-10:5 and 10:28-44, McClintock).

Regarding claims 27, 28, 29, and 33, these claims recite same limitations as claims 14, 15, 16, and 20, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 14, 15, 16, and 20 above.

Regarding claim 32, this claim recites same limitations as claim 19. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 above.

8. Claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa (US 7,187,402) in view of Bernardo (US 2002/0047895).

Regarding claim 13, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Yonezawa does not disclose enabling the user to perceive the map and relating the perceived map. However,

Bernardo discloses enabling the user to perceive the map and relating the perceived map (retrieved composite image and map) includes generating a web page (a particular web page Fig 16) enabling the user to navigate among the sensors (video camera) in the sensor array (digital video cameras 10) and to select one or more of the sensors in the sensor array ([0083]-[0086], Bernardo).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the web page as taught by Bernardo into Yonezawa's video viewing and recording system, as to provide a hyperlink for retrieving and displaying the composite images and association information preferably on a separate browser window ([0086], Bernardo).

Regarding claim 26, this claim recites same limitations as claim 13. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 13 above.

9. Claims 6, 22 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa (US 7,187,402) in view of Ritchey (US 5,495,576).

Regarding claim 6, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Yonezawa does not explicitly disclose managing the sensor array and associating the location information includes operating multiple microphone systems, where the microphone systems include a sound capture system and a location provider system. However Ritchey does teach managing the sensor array (sensor array 36, Fig 5) and associating the location information (sensors location) includes operating multiple microphone systems (microphones 39a-39f, Figs 4-5), where the microphone systems (microphones 39a-39f,) include a sound capture system (acoustical system) and a location provider system (10:17-30 and 13:24-60, Ritchey).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the acoustical system as taught by Ritchey into Yonezawa's video viewing and recording system, as to provide a multimedia system which could performing a spherical acoustical field of regard coverage about a location (13:25-61, Ritchey).

Regarding claim 22, Ritchey discloses combining the one or more streams of data units includes presenting a three dimensional presentation (three-dimensional computer generated model that comprises the virtual reality system presented to a participant) (7:30-54, Ritchey).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the three dimensional presentation as taught by Ritchey into McClintock and Valleriano's video viewing and recording system, as to provide a virtual reality/telepresence panoramic three dimensional images associated a three dimensional audio systems (7:30-54, Ritchey).

Regarding claim 35, this claim recites same limitations as claim 22. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 22 above.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa (US 7,187,402) in view of Ritchey, and further in view of Bernardo (US 2002/0047895).

Regarding claim 7, the limitations of claims 1 and 6 are taught above, Yonezawa and Ritchey do not explicitly disclose operating the multiple camera systems includes using the location provider system of the microphone system to determine location information using at least one of a Global Positioning system receiver, a gyroscope, and a local beacon. However Bernardo does teach operating the multiple camera systems (digital video cameras 10, Fig 1) includes determining location information (position information) using at least one

of a Global Positioning system receiver (a GPS receiver 16, Fig 1), a gyroscope, and a local beacon ([0033]-[0034], Bernardo).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the GPS receiver as taught by Bernardo into Yonezawa and Ritchey's video viewing and recording system, as to provide a more accurate calculation of the position information ([0034], Bernardo).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Kato et al. (US 6,697,105), Suzuki et al. (US6,002,995), Kawai et al. (US 6,680,746), Morota et al. (US 6,919,921), Oya et al. (US 6,208,379), Jain et al. (US 5,745,126), Moezzi et al. (US 5,850,352), and Mottur et al. (US 7,199,817).

Inquiries

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Wang whose telephone number is 571-270-1703. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off).
13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan V Ho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622
KW
29 October 2008